

SUMMARY OF INTERVIEW

Exhibits and/or Demonstrations

N/A

Identification of Claims Discussed

5 Claims 1, 4, 6, 8 and 11

Identification of Prior Art Discussed

U.S. Patent No. 6,859,435 to Lee et al. (“Lee”)

Proposed Amendments

10 Applicant proposed amending Claims 1, 8 and 11 by clarifying the circumstances under which higher priority frames are selected before lower priority frames, and the circumstances under which lower priority frames may be selected before pending higher priority frames.

Applicant also proposed amending Claims 4 and 6 by clarifying the function of Applicant’s counter.

Principal Arguments and Other Matters

15 With respect to Claims 1, 8 and 11, Applicant argued that Lee neither teaches nor suggests that higher priority frames are selected before lower priority frames until a threshold number of higher priority frames have been selected, after which at least one lower priority frame is selected if lower priority frames are pending.

20 With respect to Claims 4 and 6, Applicant argued that Lee neither teaches nor suggests a counter associated with each queue, each counter being configured to count frames transmitted from its associated priority queue.

Results of Interview

25 The Examiner agreed that Applicant’s proposed amendments to Claims 1, 4, 6, 8 and 11 overcame the rejections of record. The Examiner indicated, however, that he would review Lee again to verify that Lee neither teaches nor suggests that higher priority frames are selected before lower priority frames until a threshold number of higher priority frames have been selected, after which at least one lower priority frame is selected if lower priority frames are pending.